

# 2003 San Bernardino County Annual Survey



Co-Principal Investigators:

Shel Bockman, Barbara Sirotnik, and Christen Ruiz

# **THE 2003 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY ANNUAL SURVEY**

**We would like to thank the following organizations who  
generously contributed to this survey:**

## **SPONSORS:**

**First 5 of San Bernardino**

## **BENEFACTORS:**

**San Bernardino Associated Governments  
San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors**

## **AFFILIATES:**

**City of San Bernardino  
Inland California Television Network  
San Bernardino Economic Development Agency**

## INTRODUCTION

The Inland Empire Research Consortium (IERC) is pleased to present the results of its **2003 San Bernardino County Annual Survey** of residents in San Bernardino County. In previous years IERC has produced the *Inland Empire* Annual Survey, a survey of Riverside and San Bernardino County residents. For the past two years the survey has been limited to San Bernardino County and does not address public perceptions outside of the county.

The purpose of the **San Bernardino County Annual Survey** is to provide policy-related research that bears on issues important to San Bernardino County. The San Bernardino County Annual Survey provides decision-makers with objective, accurate and current information for:

- ♦ **evaluating key public and private sector services and activities** (e.g., retail services, health care, education, transportation);
- ♦ **describing the public's current views as well as changes over time** in public perceptions of such issues as: quality of life, the state of the local economy, perceptions of the region as a place to live and work, the greatest problems and issues (e.g., crime, pollution, immigration) facing San Bernardino County, commuting, traffic congestion, and promotion of economic development;
- ♦ **providing a regional focus** for the on-going discussion of key local/regional issues; and
- ♦ **disseminating a coherent picture of San Bernardino County residents' views, beliefs, and demographic characteristics** to key decision makers within and outside the county, thus enabling comparisons to other counties.

The Inland Empire Annual Survey also includes (on a space available basis), some *proprietary items* designed to meet specific information needs of some sponsors within San Bernardino County.

The IERC represents a partnership between the Institute of Applied Research and Policy Analysis at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB) and researchers at the University of California Riverside (UCR). Apart from the objectives listed above, the IERC is committed to promoting regionalism and cooperation, and to projecting the Inland Empire onto

the radar screen of other “significant actors” in the State. It is our hope that the Annual Survey will, in future years, again reflect the two-county area (rather than just San Bernardino County) and that it will continue to be a valuable area resource for initiating community discourse and helping to inform public policy, officials, and citizens by incorporating proprietary questions from public and private agencies in the two county area.

## THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire items were selected on the following basis: Several questions were incorporated from previous annual surveys of Riverside and San Bernardino counties which were designed to track changes over time in the residents’ perceptions about their quality of life and economic well-being, their views about the pressing issues of the day, and their ratings of public services and agencies. In addition, a number of standard demographic questions were included for tracking purposes and for cross tabulation of findings. Tracking questions, of course, provide public agencies and businesses with trend data often needed in policy making and outcome assessments. These questions are also valuable in comparing the county with other counties in the state and nation. A number of sponsors also submitted questions for their proprietary use. Finally, the researchers, in consultation with sponsors, also added questions concerning current issues which have policy and research implications. A draft copy of the questionnaire was submitted to the sponsors for their approval and modified where warranted. A Spanish version of the questionnaire was produced, the survey instrument was then pre-tested (both languages), and some minor changes to the wording and order of some items were made. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix I.

## SAMPLING METHODS

As indicated earlier, this year’s survey focused exclusively on residents within San Bernardino County. As part of this effort, SANBAG was also interested in region-specific differences within the county. Specifically, four regions of interest were defined: **East Valley**, **West Valley**, **Victor Valley**, and **Desert**. To ensure an acceptable level of accuracy of findings within each of the San Bernardino County regions (East Valley, West Valley, Desert, and Victor

Valley), a sample size of at least 200 respondents per region was required, yielding a 95% level of confidence and an accuracy of +/- 7% per region. Further, at the request of three of our contributors, oversamplings were conducted in various cities to ensure that requested subgroup findings would achieve an acceptable level of accuracy. As a result a total of 1,202 respondents within San Bernardino County were interviewed, but the actual number of respondents per survey item varies depending on whether the item is a baseline question or a proprietary question. In any event, the level of accuracy for the combined regions exceeds +/- 3.5% for all baseline questions which are the focus of this countywide report.

Within each region, telephone survey respondents were randomly selected from a comprehensive sample frame consisting of all telephone working blocks which contain residential telephone numbers in the region. This is a standard random sampling approach for studies of this nature. Telephone interviews were conducted by the Institute of Applied Research at California State University, San Bernardino using computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) equipment and software. The surveys were conducted between January 9, 2004 and January 27, 2004. In the following table the list of cities from which respondents come are grouped by the four San Bernardino County study areas.

**Communities and Cities Mentioned by Respondents,  
Broken Down By The Four Designated County Study Areas**

East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert Region
Big Bear Bloomington Colton Crestline Grand Terrace Highland Lake Arrowhead Loma Linda Mentone Redlands Rialto Running Springs San Bernardino Yucaipa	Chino Chino Hills Fontana Montclair Ontario Rancho Cucamonga Upland	Adelanto Apple Valley Hesperia Victorville Wrightwood	Barstow Big River Earp Hinkley Landers Morongo Valley Needles Trona TwentyninePalms Yermo Yucca Valley

## INTRODUCTION TO FINDINGS

Following are the major findings from this year's San Bernardino County Annual Survey. Findings are generally presented for San Bernardino County as a whole. In those few instances where there exist significant differences between the four regions, such dissimilarities will be noted and discussed in detail.

In addition, this report includes seven years of continuous data to conduct more extensive trend analysis than in previous reports. It must be noted that trend analysis is made more difficult because the distinct regions of East and West Valley were combined into one region during last year's survey (at the request of our sponsor) and were again separated into two distinct regions for this year's survey. The trend analysis will be conducted assuming that last year's combined zone can essentially be seen as an average for the two separate zones.

Finally, the tables in the data display and in the following sections of the report reflect a weighting scheme to correct for the over-sampling of certain geographic areas in the county mentioned above. Throughout this report, therefore, when we refer to the number of respondents indicating a particular view (a number that is a weighted figure), the actual number of respondents may differ from the adjusted figure reported in the table. For a full data display of countywide (weighted) findings, see Appendix II. Regional breakdowns are shown in Appendix III.

## COMMUTING AND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

***OVERVIEW: Since the 1998 Annual Survey, the percentage of respondents with short commute times (less than 1 hour) has remained relatively stable, but with slight increases over time. Most respondents from each zone spend less than an hour commuting to and from work. Over two-thirds work within San Bernardino County.***

The length of reported commuting times (Question 28) has remained fairly constant over time (Table 1). The key observation, however, is that almost two-thirds (65%) of San Bernardino County respondents have commuting times of less than one hour, and that during the previous years the proportion of commuters in the "less than 1 hour" category has remained

fairly constant, varying within 2-4 percentage points per year. It should be noted, however, that the 4% increase between the 2002 and 2003 surveys is slightly larger than the margin of error (as it was between the 1998 and 1999 surveys). Although this may be a statistical aberration, it is still worth noting that the small increases noted since 1997 now amount to a significant shift from 1997 to the present.

Region-specific trends and patterns have changed little from previous years, with the Desert Region showing the highest proportion of respondents with relatively short commute times (less than one hour). This figure is significantly higher than the proportion for Victor Valley respondents. But it is clear that when each region is viewed over time, the number of people with short commute times is increasing. This finding may be one empirical indicator that job creation in the Inland Empire is “paying off” throughout the county but especially in the Desert region.

**Table 1. % With Total Commuting Times of Less Than 1 Hour**

	<b>East Valley %</b>	<b>West Valley %</b>	<b>Victor Valley %</b>	<b>Desert %</b>	<b>San Bernardino County</b>
1997 Survey	69	48	60	56	<b>58</b>
1998 Survey	60	54	58	71	<b>58</b>
1999 Survey	67	56	58	72	<b>62</b>
2000 Survey	68	59	43	76	<b>61</b>
2001 Survey	67	56	56	72	<b>60</b>
2002 Survey	61		55	69	<b>61</b>
2003 Survey	68	62	59	77	<b>65</b>

Although a large majority of respondents report commuting a total of less than one hour each day, a significant number of respondents commute for longer times. Indeed, many San Bernardino County respondents commute for over two hours (11 % of East Valley, 20% of West Valley, 20% of Victor Valley, and 10.5% of Desert respondents). Longer commuting time, of course, takes its toll in terms of personal lifestyle, individual costs for gas and maintenance, implications for energy consumption, and county and state costs for the required road improvements and maintenance.

The majority (69%) of those respondents who commute to work report that they travel to work within their own county (Question 30), with Los Angeles County being the number two

destination (Table 2). This pattern has been noted in previous Annual Surveys and it continues this year.

**Table 2. County-Wide Respondents' Commuting Destinations, 1998-2003\***

<b>Work Destination County</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>
San Bernardino	72.5	73.3	70.1	69.3	67.0	69.2
Riverside	7.8	5.7	7.1	7.9	8.7	7.2
Orange	3.3	3.2	4.4	3.8	6.2	5.1
Los Angeles	13.5	14.8	15.3	16.1	16.1	15.6
San Diego	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.4
Other	2.6	2.5	2.5	1.9	1.4	2.4

\*Numbers in cells are % of respondents.

The region-specific tables in the appendix show that the largest percentage of respondents commuting outside the county to work are those residing in the West Valley (43.4%), while respondents least likely to travel outside the county to work reside in the Desert region (11.5%). Respondents traveling to Los Angeles County for work are much more likely to reside in the West Valley (26.4%) than in the other three regions combined (7.7% for East, 3.0% for Victor and none from the Desert region).

Although there are only slight percentage variations in work destination over time for the county as a whole and for each region, the bottom line is that in light of dramatically increasing population within the county, more and more county residents are on the roads each day trying to get to work. This has obvious and worrisome policy implications in that unless there is a dramatic increase in residents willing to carpool or utilize the public transportation system, San Bernardino County residents will continue to face an increasingly clogged freeway system and a local street system stressed beyond its capacity.

## **RATINGS OF THE COUNTY**

**OVERVIEW:** *As in previous surveys, a substantial majority of San Bernardino County residents in each zone continue to rate their county as a good place to live. General location continues to be mentioned as the “best” thing about living in the county, while crime and smog continue to be mentioned as the predominant negatives.*



As has been the case since the inception of the Annual Survey in 1997, the majority of residents rate San Bernardino County as a "fairly good" or "very good" place to live (Question 3).

**Table 3. Ratings of San Bernardino County as a Place to Live**

RATING	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Very good	14.8	32.1	27.4	18.3	<b>24.2</b>
Fairly good	46.4	49.2	47.9	47.3	<b>47.9</b>
Neither good nor bad	21.6	12.3	17.5	22.8	<b>17.0</b>
Fairly bad	7.8	3.0	3.9	5.4	<b>5.0</b>
Very bad	8.2	2.0	2.4	2.9	<b>4.4</b>

Further, as Table 4 shows, the highest rankings came from the West Valley zone, a trend that has been in place since 1997. The ratings in 2003 have improved significantly from the 1997 ratings in East Valley, West Valley, and the Desert regions.

**Table 4. Trend -- Proportion of Respondents Indicating Their County Is A "Very Good" or "Fairly Good" Place to Live**

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %
1997 Survey	50	76	67	63
1998 Survey	58	76	66	69
1999 Survey	59	78	71	64
2000 Survey	55	77	73	63
2001 Survey	65	77	77	69
2002 Survey	73		75	68
2003 Survey	61	81	75	66

To help place the above findings in perspective, respondents were asked to indicate the one BEST and one MOST NEGATIVE thing about living in the county (Questions 4 and 5). San Bernardino County residents continue to cite the general area and location as the most positive aspect of living in the county, along with the climate and weather (Table 5). Affordable housing, while down slightly from last year, is still ranked third whereas until two years ago, this wasn't even on residents' "radar screen" of best things about the county.

**Table 5. Positive Factors Mentioned About the County**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	2003 SB County	2002 SB County
Good area, location, scenery	48%	33%	31%	38%	39%	41%
Good Climate, weather	14%	12%	26%	20%	15%	9%
Affordable housing	9%	16%	10%	6%	12%	13%
Not crowded	5%	10%	14%	11%	9%	10%

For the second year in a row, crime and gang activity has surpassed smog/air pollution as the most often mentioned negative factor. This is true even in the Desert zone, an area not known for its crime. Further, fewer respondents in the Victor Valley region mentioned lack of job opportunity/economy as the most negative factor (10% last year compared to only 4% this year), while remaining relatively constant in the other three regions.

**Table 6. Negative Factors Mentioned About the County**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	2003 SB County	2002 SB County
Crime, gang activity	28%	16%	7%	12%	20%	19%
Smog, air pollution	14%	16%	9%	5%	14%	14%
Traffic	8%	10%	16%	6%	10%	11%
Lack of job opportunity/economy	4%	3%	4%	6%	4%	7%

It is important to note that “drug problems” continue to be mentioned by respondents in each of the four zones as a negative factor about living in San Bernardino County. When it is combined with “crime and gang activity” it is clear that this is a problem which policy makers must continue to address. On the other hand, it is encouraging that the percentages mentioning crime as a negative factor have not significantly changed since last year’s survey. In fact, the percentage of respondents in the Victor Valley region who mentioned crime as the most negative factor decreased from 14% last year to only 7% this year (see 2002 Annual Survey report).

In the 1999 report, we had noted that smog/air pollution had dramatically disappeared as a highly salient negative thing about county life in the minds of respondents. In 2000 it returned as a pressing concern in two of the four zones (East and West Valley). For the past three years it

appears to be a concern in *all* zones, and the figures for all zones are relatively unchanged from the 2001 survey.

**Table 7.**  
**% Mentioning Smog as a Negative Factor**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert
1997 Survey	14%	19%	5%	2%
1998 Survey	11%	15%	7%	3%
1999 Survey	0%	2%	0%	0%
2000 Survey	16%	15%	3%	1%
2001 Survey	17%	17%	8%	6%
2002 Survey	16%		7%	7%
2003 Survey	14%	16%	9%	5%

## **FEAR OF CRIME AND CRIME RELATED ISSUES**

**OVERVIEW:** *With the exception of residents in the Victor Valley Region, fear among San Bernardino County residents of being the victim of a serious crime is slightly on the rise from previous years.*

In 2001 we reported a dramatic decrease in the percentage of San Bernardino County residents who reported being “very” or “somewhat” fearful of being the victim of a serious crime. However, it appears that this fear may be on the rise again. When the question was asked directly: “how fearful are you that you will be a victim of a serious crime, such as a violent or costly crime” (Question 10), 39% of county residents express that they are either “very fearful” or “somewhat fearful” (up from 35% last year).

It is difficult to interpret the trend (if any) over time in fear of crime. From one point of view, it might appear that the 41% in 2000 was an anomaly, and indeed the fear had been decreasing and is now rising again. From another point of view, one could review the 7 years of data and conclude that there has been no real overall trend...rather there has been significant variability in terms of precise percentages of those people fearful of being a victim of crime. Regardless of point of view, perhaps the most important point to emphasize is that over the past seven years, approximately 4 in 10 people have been seriously concerned about being the victim of a serious crime.

Which regions’ respondents hold the most fear of crime? East and West Valley

respondents continue to express a higher level of fear of being the victim of a serious crime than respondents in the Victor Valley and the Desert regions. This has been the trend for most of the historical data shown below.

**Table 8.**  
**% “Very Fearful” or “Somewhat Fearful” of being the victim of a serious crime**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	46%	41%	40%	36%	<b>43%</b>
1998 Survey	48%	38%	33%	20%	<b>40%</b>
1999 Survey	38%	36%	37%	23%	<b>36%</b>
2000 Survey	48%	39%	33%	24%	<b>41%</b>
2001 Survey	35%	32%	25%	21%	<b>32%</b>
2002 Survey	35%		34%	26%	<b>35%</b>
2003 Survey	44%	38%	29%	29%	<b>39%</b>

## **ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS**

***OVERVIEW:** In spite of the numerous budgetary problems at the State and County levels, perceptions of the county’s economy are only slightly down. Equally encouraging is that respondents rated their own personal financial well-being slightly better than it was a year ago. But there has been a significant decrease in the percentage of people indicating that they have enough income to save and buy extras.*

Although there has been an ebb and flow in public evaluation about the state of the county’s economy, generally approximately 4 in 10 people rate the economy as “excellent” or “good.” This year’s data is no exception. County-wide, perceptions of the economy are only slightly down from last year. There are a host of reasons why this slight decrease may have occurred, ranging from an acknowledgement of the budgetary crisis that the State is currently facing, to fears of a national slow-down. But overall it is amazing that the figures are holding fairly steady given all that has transpired within the county, state, and nation over the past three years.

When looking at regional differences, it is interesting to note that respondents in the West Valley and Victor Valley hold the strongest ratings of the county’s economy, whereas respondents in the East Valley and Desert regions hold significantly lower evaluations of the

state of the economy.

**Table 9.**  
**% Rating the County's Economy as “Excellent” or “Good”**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	20%	46%	14%	24%	<b>28%</b>
1998 Survey	39%	56%	33%	39%	<b>45%</b>
1999 Survey	35%	62%	39%	39%	<b>47%</b>
2000 Survey	39%	51%	37%	37%	<b>44%</b>
2001 Survey	32%	46%	41%	27%	<b>39%</b>
2002 Survey	46%		27%	26%	<b>43%</b>
2003 Survey	26%	49%	46%	25%	<b>39%</b>

There are several other indicators of county economic well being in this study which cloud the picture slightly. Respondents offered perceptions about their own *personal* economic well being, and these were not necessarily consistent with their ratings of the county economy. Responding to the question “In comparison to a year ago, would you say that you and your family are better off, worse off, or the same” (Question 6) the percentage of respondents reporting being "better off" when compared with a year before has increased while the overall rating of the economy in the county decreased.

**Table 10.**  
**% Indicating Their Finances Are "Better Off" Compared With a Year Ago**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	39%	38%	28%	22%	<b>34%</b>
1998 Survey	44%	52%	38%	35%	<b>46%</b>
1999 Survey	38%	48%	35%	38%	<b>42%</b>
2000 Survey	38%	44%	42%	40%	<b>41%</b>
2001 Survey	35%	42%	36%	36%	<b>38%</b>
2002 Survey	30%		24%	32%	<b>30%</b>
2003 Survey	35%	36%	33%	33%	<b>35%</b>

Further, approximately half of respondents in each zone remain optimistic about their own finances, and expect to be “better off” in terms of their family finances a year from now (Question 8). These findings are consistent with those in previous years which indicate that people tend to be optimistic about the future regarding their finances, even if they are less than

pleased with their current economic state.

Another indicator of personal economic well being is the question: “Thinking about your household income, would you say that it is *enough so that you can save money* or buy some extras, *just enough to meet your bills and obligations*, or *is it not enough* to meet your bills and obligations” (Question 7). County-wide, the percentage of respondents who report having enough money to save and buy extras has decreased (Table 11). However, when looking at regional differences, we see a marked increase in the percent of residents in both the Victor Valley region and the Desert region who report that they have enough money to save and buy extras, and a decrease among East and West Valley residents from last year. These findings reinforce from the previous survey which pointed out that there was a continuing and widening polarization occurring between the “haves” (those who indicate that they have enough money to save and buy extras) and “have nots” (those who report being somewhat strapped for funds).

**Table 11.**  
**% Indicating Their Household Income Is Sufficient To Save And Buy Extras**

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %	SB County
1997 Survey	35%	44%	27%	27%	36%
1998 Survey	40%	46%	45%	40%	43%
1999 Survey	42%	41%	31%	39%	40%
2000 Survey	41%	42%	36%	35%	40%
2001 Survey	42%	45%	48%	43%	43%
2002 Survey	42%		36%	30%	41%
2003 Survey	37%	39%	46%	37%	35%

## EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

**OVERVIEW:** *Ratings of private and public services have not changed significantly over time in the county overall, with high marks continuing to be given to Police/Sheriff services, shopping, and parks/recreation services. On the other hand, street/road maintenance, transportation, and public schools continue to be problem areas.*

Each year the Annual Survey includes questions regarding respondents’ evaluations of local services from both the private and public sectors. Over time, there has been remarkable

stability in rankings. The following table details the percentage of respondents who indicate that the services are “excellent” or “good” (Questions 15 to 21).

**Table 12.**  
**% Rating Local Services as “Excellent” or “Good”**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	<b>SB County</b>
Police/Sheriff	62%	77%	64%	55%	<b>69%</b>
Shopping	59%	76%	62%	34%	<b>66%</b>
Parks/Recreation	45%	68%	53%	49%	<b>56%</b>
Entertainment	44%	58%	37%	27%	<b>49%</b>
Public Schools	37%	55%	44%	39%	<b>46%</b>
Transportation	41%	39%	32%	31%	<b>38%</b>
Street/Road Maintenance	27%	50%	16%	23%	<b>35%</b>

As in previous years, police/sheriff services received the highest rankings countywide (Table 12). The highest level of “support” for police/sheriff services was in the West Valley region. Shopping also received extremely high ratings countywide with the notable exception being the Desert region in which only about a third of respondents ranked shopping as “excellent” or “good.” Street/roads maintenance continues to receive the lowest ranking in all regions with the exception of West Valley. What is particularly disturbing is that in last year’s report we noted that “the problems with street and road maintenance appear to be especially severe (from the respondents’ perception) in the Victor Valley and Desert regions,” yet this year’s figures are even lower (16% in Victor Valley this year, down from 21%; and 23% in the Desert this year, virtually unchanged from 25% last year).

As noted in previous reports, there has been a high degree of stability in ratings of local services since 1997 (Table 13). One special note: this year the percentage of respondents rating each service as “excellent” or “good” declined slightly from last year, with the exception of entertainment which remained the same.

**Table 13.**  
**Trends in “Excellent” or “Good” Ratings of Services**

SERVICE	1997 Annual Survey	1998 Annual Survey	1999 Annual Survey	2000 Annual Survey	2001 Annual Survey	2002 Annual Survey	<b>2003 Annual Survey</b>
Police/Sheriff	66%	65%	70%	64%	66%	71%	<b>69%</b>
Shopping	N/A	65%	68%	63%	68%	70%	<b>66%</b>

Parks/Recreation	56%	56%	60%	58%	58%	58%	<b>56%</b>
Public Schools	47%	51%	46%	41%	45%	51%	<b>46%</b>
Entertainment	N/A	50%	49%	43%	46%	49%	<b>49%</b>
Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A	36%	42%	40%	<b>38%</b>
Streets/Roads	26%	35%	38%	33%	34%	39%	<b>35%</b>

## CONFIDENCE IN ELECTED OFFICIALS

**OVERVIEW:** *Although the majority of zone residents have at least some level of confidence that their elected city officials will adopt policies that will benefit the general community, there remains about a third of the respondents with either “not much” or “no” confidence in their elected officials.*

Respondents were asked: “How much confidence do you have that the elected officials in your city will adopt policies that will benefit the general community” (Question 22). A majority of respondents in all zones indicated that they have “some” confidence (53.5%) or a “great deal” of confidence (9.9%) that their elected city officials will adopt policies that will benefit the community. These county-wide figures have remained relatively stable over time.

**Table 14.**  
**% Reporting a "Great Deal" or "Some" Confidence**  
**in Their Elected Officials**

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	<b>SB County</b>
1997 Survey	58%	78%	51%	56%	<b>63%</b>
1998 Survey	55%	69%	57%	54%	<b>61%</b>
1999 Survey	56%	66%	52%	49%	<b>59%</b>
2000 Survey	60%	71%	58%	52%	<b>64%</b>
2001 Survey	53%	65%	54%	55%	<b>59%</b>
2002 Survey	69%		51%	52%	<b>66%</b>
2003 Survey	60%	68%	65%	47%	<b>63%</b>

It is notable that there has been a significant upturn in respondents from the Victor Valley area who rate positively their elected officials. The other zones showed only slight increases or decreases. On the other hand, a significant proportion of people within each of the zones (about a third in the East, West and Victor Valleys and over one-half in the Desert region) expressed either “not much” or “no” confidence in their elected officials. The reader should also note that



one's view of the category "some" confidence (i.e. whether that is a positive or a negative statement) will have a significant impact in how one evaluates the citizens opinions regarding their elected officials.

## **FINAL NOTE**

In this report we have presented countywide and zone-specific findings from the 2003 San Bernardino County Annual Survey. The reader is encouraged to review the full data displays (attached) for the complete listing of survey results. This report will be added to previous Annual Surveys on our web site (<http://iar.csusb.edu>) for those who wish to engage in more detailed comparative analysis with previous years' reports.

For questions about the San Bernardino County Annual Survey (or additional analysis tailored to a particular organization or agency), please contact the authors: Shel Bockman (909-880-5733), Barbara Sirotnik (909-880-5729), or Christen Ruiz (909-473-8312).

# APPENDIX I

## Questionnaire

### **SAN BERNARDINO ANNUAL SURVEY, 2003**

**SHELLO** Hello, I am calling from the Institute of Applied Research at Cal State San Bernardino.

**SHEAD** Are you the head of this household or his or her spouse?

1. Yes [SKIP TO INTRO]
2. No [CONTINUE]
3. DON'T KNOW/NO RESPONSE
4. REFUSED

**SHEAD2** Is the head of the household or his or her spouse at home?

1. Yes [SKIP TO INTRO]
2. No [CONTINUE]
3. DON'T KNOW/NO RESPONSE
4. REFUSED

**INTRO** California State University San Bernardino is conducting a scientific study of public opinion on a variety of issues. Answers to this survey will be used by county officials to make policy decisions and your opinions are very important to represent your point of view in our study. This survey takes less than 10 minutes to complete. Your identity and your responses will remain completely anonymous and confidential, and of course, you are free to decline to answer any particular survey question.

I should also mention that this call may be monitored by my supervisor for quality control purposes only. Is it alright to ask you these questions now?

1. YES [SKIP TO BEGIN]
2. NO [SKIP TO APPT]

**AGEQAL** First, I'd like to verify that you are at least 18 years of age.

1. Yes [SKIP TO BEGIN]
2. No

**QSORRY** I'm sorry, but currently we are interviewing people 18 years of age and older. Thank you for your time. [TERMINATE INTERVIEW]

**APPT** Is it possible to make an appointment to ask you the survey questions at a more convenient time?

1. Yes (SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
2. No

**BEGIN** I'd like to begin by asking you some general questions.

**COUNTY** First, I'd like to verify that you currently live in San Bernardino County. Is that correct?

1. Yes
2. No [TERMINATE INTERVIEW]

- B1. What city do you live in?
1. Code directly \_\_\_\_\_
  2. DON'T KNOW
  3. REFUSED
- B2. What is your zip code?
1. Code directly \_\_\_\_\_
  2. DON'T KNOW
  3. REFUSED
- B3. Overall, how would you rate San Bernardino County as a place to live? Would you say it is Very Good, Fairly Good, Neither Good Nor Bad, Fairly Bad, or Very Bad?
1. Very good
  2. Fairly good
  3. Neither good nor bad
  4. Fairly bad
  5. Very bad
  6. DON'T KNOW
  7. REFUSED

**ROTATE THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS (B4 and B5)**

- B4. In your opinion, what is the ONE best thing about living in San Bernardino County?
- [INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ OPTIONS]**
1. Good area, location, scenery
  2. Affordable housing
  3. Good climate, weather
  4. Not crowded
  5. Good schools/universities
  6. Less crime, feel safe
  7. Job availability
  8. Friendly people
  666. Other SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_
  777. NOTHING
  888. DON'T KNOW
  999. REFUSED

B5. In your opinion, what would you say is the ONE most negative thing about living in San Bernardino County? **[INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ OPTIONS]**

1. Smog, air pollution
2. Traffic
3. Poor public transportation
4. Drugs
5. Crime/Gang activity
6. Bad location
7. Lack of entertainment
8. Overpopulated
9. Bad school system
10. Cost of living
11. Lack of job opportunity
666. Other SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_
777. NOTHING
888. DON'T KNOW
999. REFUSED

B6. In comparison to a year ago, would you say that you and your family are financially better off or worse off or the same?

1. Better off
2. Same
3. Worse off
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSE

B7. Thinking about your household income, would you say that it is enough so that you can save money and buy some extras, just enough to meet your bills and obligations, or is it not enough to meet your bills and obligations?

1. Enough to save and buy extras
2. Just enough to pay bills
3. Not enough
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSE

B8. Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now you and your family will be better off, worse off, or just about the same as you are now?

1. Better off
2. Same
3. Worse off
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSE

B9. In general, how would you rate the economy in San Bernardino County today? Would you say that it is Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

B10. In general, how fearful are you that YOU will be the victim of a serious crime, such as a violent or costly crime? Would you say that you are...

1. Very fearful
2. Somewhat fearful
3. Not too fearful, or . . .
4. Not at all fearful
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

TRANS: I would now like to ask you some questions about voting.

B11. Are you currently registered to vote?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED TO ANSWER

B12. Which of the following best describes your political party affiliation: Democrat, Republican, Independent, or some other party?

1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Independent
4. Some other Party
5. None
6. DON'T KNOW
7. REFUSED TO ANSWER

B13. Would you say that you vote in all elections, only some, hardly ever or never?

1. In all elections
2. Only in some
3. Hardly ever
4. Never
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

B14. Politically, do you consider yourself to be..... **INTERVIEWER: READ OPTIONS**

1. Very liberal
2. Somewhat liberal
3. Middle of the road
4. Somewhat conservative
5. Very conservative
6. DON'T KNOW
7. REFUSED

(TRANS) Now, I'd like to ask you how you rate some of the local public and private services you are supposed to receive. For each would you let me know if you believe the service is excellent, good, fair, or poor. **(ROTATE B15 – B21)**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>REFUSE</u>
B15. Police/Sheriff	1	2	3	4	5	6
B16. Parks and Recreation	1	2	3	4	5	6
B17. The way streets and roads are kept up	1	2	3	4	5	6
B18. Public schools	1	2	3	4	5	6
B19. Shopping	1	2	3	4	5	6
B20. Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
B21. Entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	6

B22. How much confidence do you have that the elected officials in your city or community will adopt policies that will benefit the general community? Would you say you have a “great deal”, “some”, “not much,” or “no confidence?”

1. A great deal of confidence
2. Some confidence
3. Not much confidence
4. No confidence
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

B23. Are you currently employed?

1. Yes [SKIP TO **B25**]
2. No
3. REFUSED

B24. **ASK IF CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED:** Are you...

1. Retired
2. Looking for work
3. A housewife/househusband and not looking for work outside the home; or
4. Not currently in workforce
5. REFUSED

**SKIP TO QUESTION #34a**

B25. Do you work full time or part time?

1. Full time
2. Part time
3. REFUSED

B26. What is your occupation? Specify \_\_\_\_\_ \* **USE CODING FROM LAST YEAR**

B27. How concerned are you that you might lose your job? Would you say you are:

1. Very concerned
2. Somewhat concerned
3. Not at all concerned
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

B28. When thinking about your travel to and from work, on the average, how much total time, **in minutes**, do you spend commuting **both ways** each day?

[INTERVIEWER: CODE # MINUTES]

777. Doesn't apply; don't work outside home or I am not employed  
888. DON'T KNOW  
999. REFUSED

29. How many miles roundtrip do you travel to work each day?

[INTERVIEWER: ENTER # OF MILES]

- 888.DON'T KNOW  
999. REFUSED

B30. What county do you work in?

1. Riverside
2. San Bernardino
3. Orange
4. Los Angeles
5. San Diego
6. Other: \_\_\_\_\_
7. DON'T KNOW
8. REFUSED

**ICTN QUESTIONS**



***THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ONLY TO BE ASKED IN THE CITIES OF: Big Bear, Chino, Colton, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Highland, Loma Linda, Montclair, Ontario, Rancho Cucamonga, Redlands, Rialto, San Bernardino, Upland and Yucaipa***

- 34a. What television service do you have? Is it cable, satellite or non-paid television off a home antenna?
1. Cable
  2. Satellite
  3. Non-paid television off a home antenna
  4. DON'T KNOW
  5. REFUSED
34. Starting last November, your city began receiving live, local TV news on cable Channel 3 as part of a regional network, ICTN, created by Cal State, San Bernardino. Have you seen any of ICTN's newscasts, which are shown at 10 PM and 10:30 on Channel 3 Monday-Friday and KVCR Channel 24 at 11 PM?
1. Yes
  2. No
  3. DON'T KNOW
  4. REFUSED
- 35a. **IF "YES" TO QUESTION #34:**  
How would you rate the quality of the program? Was it excellent, good, fair, or poor?
1. Excellent
  2. Good
  3. Fair
  4. Poor
  5. DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION
  6. REFUSED
- 35ax. What is the main reason for your rating? [OPEN ENDED QUESTION]
- 35b. **IF "NO" to QUESTION #34:** Would you be interested in watching a community-based news channel?
1. Yes
  2. No [SKIP TO B36]
  3. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO B36]
  4. REFUSED [SKIP TO B36]
- 35c. I'm going to read you a list of various types of local TV programming. Which one of these would you be most likely to watch? Programs that focus on:

1. Local business and economic development
2. Cultural or music programs
3. Educational programs, maybe for college credit
4. Public affairs and local politics
5. Local sports round-up
6. NONE OF THE ABOVE
7. NOT INTERESTED IN LOCAL TV PROGRAMMING
8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

### **CFC QUESTIONS**

Now we have a few questions submitted by one of the sponsors of the survey, the San Bernardino County Children and Families Commission which is also known as First 5 San Bernardino. Their questions concern health-related issues. First:

39a. Do you have any children that are under the age of 18?

1. Yes
2. No [SKIP TO B55]
3. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO B55]
4. REFUSED [SKIP TO B55]

39. How many children in your household are ten years old or younger?

1. None [SKIP TO B55]
2. One
3. More than one
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

IF NO CHILDREN, THEN SKIP TO QUESTION #55.

IF ONE CHILD, CONTINUE

40. How many of the children are five years of age or younger?

1. None
2. One
3. More than one
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

**IF MORE THAN ONE CHILD BELOW 5 YEARS OLD, ASK RESPONDENT: “for the next series of questions, please think in terms of the child who is the oldest child, but who is 5 years old or less.”**

**IF NO CHILDREN BELOW 5 YEARS OLD, ASK RESPONDENT: “for the next series of questions, please think of your youngest child and answer the questions for when they were five years old or younger.”**

**IF ONE CHILD BELOW 5 YEARS OLD, ASK RESPONDENT: For the next series of questions, please think in terms of your child who is five years old or younger.**

41. Is the child a boy or a girl? **[INTERVIEWER: MAKE NOTE OF THIS SO YOU CAN USE THE PROPER GENDER FOR THE REST OF THE SURVEY]**
42. What is the source of your child’s health insurance? **[INTERVIEWER: DON’T READ]**
  1. Insurance from respondent’s place of employment
  2. Private insurance purchased for child
  3. Medi-Cal
  4. Healthy Families
  5. Other
  6. Not Covered
  7. DON’T KNOW
  8. REFUSED
43. Where do you usually go for health care for this child? **[INTERVIEWER: DON’T READ]**
  1. No regular care
  2. Regular care from a doctor, nurse practitioner or clinic
  3. Emergency room
  4. Urgent care
  5. Other type of healer
  6. Other
  7. DON’T KNOW
  8. REFUSED
44. Has your child ever been checked to make sure that he/she is on track with developing the motor and social skills typical for his/her age?
  1. Yes
  2. No
  3. DON’T KNOW
  4. REFUSED
45. IF “YES” TO QUESTION #44, ASK: Who checked him/her? **INTERVIEWER: DON’T READ...RECORD ALL THAT APPLY]**
  1. Regular doctor

2. Health or mental health care provider
  3. Specialist
  4. Teacher
  5. Someone else
  6. DON'T KNOW
  7. REFUSED
46. How often do you read to your child or tell him/her stories?
1. Virtually every day
  2. Several times a week
  3. Once a week
  4. Less than once a week
  5. Virtually never
  6. DON'T KNOW
  7. REFUSED
47. How often do you play together with your child?
1. Virtually every day
  2. Several times a week
  3. Once a week
  4. Less than once a week
  5. Virtually never
  6. DON'T KNOW
  7. REFUSED
48. In the past six months, have you taken your child to any outdoor or physical activities such as the park, pool, recreation class or gym?
1. Yes
  2. No
  3. DON'T KNOW
  4. REFUSED
- 49a. IF "NO" TO QUESTION #48, ask: "Why not?" **[INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ...RECORD FIRST RESPONSE]**
1. Did not know where to go (not aware of any)

2. Inconvenient location
  3. In unsafe geographic area
  4. Unsafe play equipment
  5. Too expensive
  6. Hours too limited
  7. Did not have the time or interest
  8. Prefer to have my child play in the back yard where I can watch
  98. DON'T KNOW
  99. REFUSED
- 49b. IF "YES" TO QUESTION #48, ask: How satisfied are you with the availability of facilities to promote the physical development of your child? Would you say that you are not satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or satisfied?
1. Not satisfied
  2. Somewhat satisfied
  3. Satisfied
  4. DON'T KNOW
  5. REFUSED
- 49c. IF "NOT SATISFIED" TO QUESTION #49B: What could be done to improve things?  
**OPEN ENDED QUESTION...RECORD FIRST RESPONSE**
50. If you were concerned about the emotional development of your child, would you know where to look in your community for support, advice or counseling?
1. Yes
  2. No
  3. DON'T KNOW
  4. REFUSED
51. Some people who want information about parenting go to community sources like a new parents group or parenting classes. Are you aware of such groups in your community?
1. Yes
  2. No **[GO TO QUESTION #53]**
  3. DON'T KNOW
  4. REFUSED
52. Have you ever used such parenting support services?
1. Yes
  2. No
  3. DON'T KNOW
  4. REFUSED
- 52a. IF "YES" TO QUESTION #52: Were you satisfied with the availability of the services?
1. Yes
  2. No

3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

52b. IF "NO" TO QUESTION #52: What is the main reason you didn't use these services?  
**[INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ...RECORD FIRST RESPONSE]**

1. Didn't need them
2. Unable to find
3. Inconvenient location
4. Too expensive
5. Didn't have the time
6. Other
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

53. At times some people may want information about the mental health of their child. If you wanted this kind of information, would you know where to go to get it?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

54. Overall, how would you rate San Bernardino County as a place to raise young children? Would you rate it excellent, good, fair, or poor?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

**THE NEXT QUESTIONS WILL BE ASKED OF *EVERYONE*, NOT JUST PARENTS OF KIDS 0 – 10**

55. Have you heard about First 5 San Bernardino or the San Bernardino Children and Families Commission?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

56. IF "YES" TO QUESTION #55: Where did you hear about First 5? **[INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ...RECORD ALL THAT APPLY]**

1. Brochures

2. Other advertising
3. Word of mouth
4. Service provider (doctor, social worker, teacher, other professional)
5. Other
98. DON'T REMEMBER
99. REFUSED

(TRANS) And finally I'd like to ask a few questions about you and your background...

B57. Which of the following best describes your marital status?

1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Divorced
4. Widowed
5. REFUSED

B59. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

B60. How would you describe your race or ethnicity?

**SELECT ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Asian (Specify)
2. Black or African American
3. Caucasian or White
4. Other (Specify)
5. Don't Know
6. Refused

B61. What was the last grade of school that you completed?

1. Some high school or less
2. High school graduate
3. Some college
4. College graduate (Bachelor's degree)
5. Some graduate work
6. Post-graduate degree
7. DON'T KNOW
8. REFUSED

B62. How many cars do you have for your household? \_\_\_\_ cars

B63. What was your age at your last birthday? \_\_\_\_\_ Years

B64. How long have you lived in San Bernardino County? \_\_\_\_\_ Years (ROUND UP)

B65. Which of the following categories best describes your total household or family income before taxes, from all sources, for 2002?

1. Less than \$25,000
2. \$25,000 to \$35,999
3. \$36,000 to \$49,999
4. \$50,000 to \$65,999
5. \$66,000 to \$79,999
6. \$80,000 to \$110,000
7. Over \$110,000
8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

Well, that's it. Thank you very much for your time - we appreciate it.

---

### **INTERVIEWER QUESTIONS**

IQ1. The respondent was...

1. Male
2. Female
3. Couldn't tell

IQ2. How cooperative was the respondent?

1. Cooperative
2. Uncooperative
3. Very Uncooperative

IQ3. How well did the respondent understand the questions?

1. Very easily
2. Easily
3. Some difficulty
4. Great deal of difficulty

IQ4. In what language was the interview conducted?

1. English
2. Spanish



# APPENDIX II

## Data Display

# APPENDIX III

## Data Display Regional Breakdown